

the floor of the House. That is to ensure that we do the kind of work that translates to our constituents.

I think there are 51 pages of politically motivated investigatory activities. They have already spent \$8 million, and now in the appropriations bill we do not know how much more, and neither of the committees have brought about any results.

I would think we would do well to pass this amendment dealing with the recycling, to pass the amendment dealing with the issue of the bus passes, and spend more of our dollars enhancing the constituency services of our offices.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule which would prohibit use of funds from the reserve fund after October 1, 1998. The amendment would allow, however, the payment of obligations legitimately incurred before the October 1 deadline.

The effect of the amendment would be a return to paying for unexpected costs through an expense resolution approved by a vote of the House, as we have in past Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the text of the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider the amendment specified in Section 3 of this resolution. The amendment may be offered only by Representative Hoyer of Maryland or his designee, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall be debatable for 30 minutes.

SEC. 3. The amendment described in Section 2 is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 311. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for payments from the reserve fund for unanticipated expenses of committees pursuant to clause 5(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, or to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the House of Representatives who certifies, approves, or processes any disbursement of funds from any such fund pursuant to an allocation approved by the Committee on House Oversight on or after October 1, 1998."

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the

opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership *Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives*, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

The vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I urge that the previous question be defeated, and that we have the opportunity to offer the Hoyer amendment as part of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just remind my colleagues that while this rule is structured, the amendments it makes in order are Democratic amendments.

I would also like to remind my colleagues that funding for the legislative branch has been pared down significantly over 4 years, resulting in a 15 percent downsizing. The underlying legislation is bipartisan, and we should congratulate this subcommittee for

their hard work by adopting this rule and moving on to debate the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this resolution will be postponed until later today.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, the Chair will now put the question on the resolutions on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order: House Resolution 491, House Resolution 485, ordering the previous question on House Resolution 489, and adoption of House Resolution 489.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE FOR INDEPENDENCE DAY STRICT WORK PERIOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 491, on which further proceedings were postponed.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 188, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

YEAS—225

Aderholt	Ballenger	Bass
Archer	Barr	Bateman
Armey	Barrett (NE)	Bereuter
Bachus	Bartlett	Bilbray
Baker	Barton	Bilirakis